

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 remain pending in the application.

Allowable Claim

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 7 and 12 recite allowable subject matter. Claims 7 and 12 are amended herein to be in independent form. Claims 7 and 12 are now in condition for allowance.

35 USC 112 Second Paragraph Rejection of Claims 5 and 10

The Office Action rejected claims 5 and 10 as allegedly being indefinite under 35 USC 112. In particular, the recited phrase "such as" allegedly renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are parts of the claimed features.

The claims have been reviewed and are amended where appropriate. It is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in full conformance with 35 USC 112. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 8-10 and 13 over Trost in view of Jasinski

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 8-10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0151275 to Trost et al. ("Trost") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,142,279 to Jasinski et al. ("Jasinski"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-3 recite a frequency offset history table adapted to contain a plurality of entries each corresponding to a past frequency offset of a device in a piconet. Claims 4, 5, 8-10 and 13 recite looking up a past frequency offset value of a transmitting piconet device.

The Examiner acknowledges practically all of the claimed features of claims 1-5, 8-10 and 13, i.e., a frequency offset history table adapted to contain a plurality of entries each corresponding to a past frequency offset of a device in a piconet wherein an expected center frequency of a signal received by

a receiver portion is adjusted based on one of a plurality of entries in the frequency offset history table corresponding to a device transmitting the signal are not disclosed by Trost (Office Action, pages 2 and 3). The Office Action relies on Jasinski to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Trost to arrive at the claimed features. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner alleges that Jasinski discloses the deficiencies in Trost, i.e., a frequency offset history table adapted to contain a plurality of entries each corresponding to a past frequency offset of a device in a piconet wherein an expected center frequency of a signal received by a receiver portion is adjusted based on one of a plurality of entries in the frequency offset history table corresponding to a device transmitting the signal. However, Jasinski fails to even mention use of a piconet and any type of history table and storage of a past frequency offset value. Therefore, since Jasinski fails to disclose use of a piconet, a history table and a past frequency offset value, Jasinski fails to disclose or suggest a frequency offset history table adapted to contain a plurality of entries each corresponding to a past frequency offset of a device in a piconet and looking up a past frequency offset value of a transmitting piconet device, as recited by claims 1-5, 8-10 and 13.

The Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to modify Trost with the disclosure of Jasinski "to provide a paging system in which each pager within a batch of addressed pagers is capable of determining which message within a batch of messages is intended for such pager." (Office Action, page 3). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner is modifying Trost with the disclosure of Jasinski. Trost fails to disclose a paging system. Therefore modifying Trost to include a paging system, much less a paging system in which each pager within a batch of addressed pagers is capable of determining which message within a batch of messages is intended for such pager is nonsensical. Nothing within Trost nor Jasinski suggests taking a Bluetooth system (Trost) and modifying it with components from a paging system (Jasinski) to provide a paging system in which each pager within a batch of addressed pagers is capable of determining which

message within a batch of messages is intended for such pager. The Examiner's motivation of modifying Trost with Jasinski is really just what Jasinski discloses, not a desire for the modification. However, modifying Trost to perform paging functions that have nothing to do with Trost's original contribution to the art is nonsensical.

Trost modified by Jasinski fails to disclose, teach or suggest a frequency offset history table adapted to contain a plurality of entries each corresponding to a past frequency offset of a device in a piconet including a smart compensation wireless piconet device; and looking up a past frequency offset value of a transmitting piconet device, as respectively recited claimed by 1-5, 8-10 and 13.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-5, 8-10 and 13 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 11 over Trost in view of Jasinski and Ericsson

In the Office Action, claims 6 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Trost in view of Jasinski, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,884, 178 to Ericsson et al. (Ericsson"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6 and 11 are dependent on claims 4 and 9 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 4 and 9.

Claims 6 and 11 recite looking up a past frequency offset value of a transmitting piconet device.

As discussed above, Trost in view of Jasinski fails to disclose or suggest looking up a past frequency offset value of a transmitting piconet device, as recited by claims 6 and 11.

The Office Action relies on Ericsson to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Trost in view of Jasinski to arrive at the claimed features. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner alleges that the motivation to modify Trost with the disclosure of Jasinski and Ericsson is to provide a method for accurately estimating the speed of a mobile station in a cellular communications system through frequency offset calculation (Office Action, page 5). However, again this is nonsensical. Nothing within Trost, Jasinski and Ericsson suggests taking a Bluetooth system (Trost) modified with components from a paging system (Jasinski), and further modified by components from a cellular system (Ericsson) that would result in a method for accurately estimating the speed of a mobile station in a cellular communications system through frequency offset calculation. The Examiner's motivation of modifying Trost with Jasinski and Ericsson is really just what Ericsson discloses, not a desire for the modification. Therefore, modifying Trost to perform paging functions and cellular functions that have nothing to do with Trost's original contribution to the art is nonsensical.

Thus, Trost modified by Jasinski and Ericsson fails to disclose, teach or suggest looking up a past frequency offset value of a transmitting piconet device, as recited by claims 6 and 11.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 6 and 11 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC

2000 M Street, NW 7TH Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df